



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America
1914

VOL. XXIX, 1

NEW SERIES, VOL. XXII, 1

I.—THE ORIGIN OF THE EASTER PLAY

Of the mediæval religious plays that emerged from the Roman liturgy the earliest, so far as we know, is associated with Easter Day.¹ The impulse toward the creation of this particular play finds its first definite record in a di-

¹ For his assertion that the Christmas play is older than the Easter play Professor Wilhelm Meyer (*Fragmenta Burana*, Berlin, 1901, pp. 37, 38, 173) offers no evidence. The dramatic Easter trope *Quem quæritis in sepulchro* is found in manuscripts of the tenth century (St. Gall ms. 484 and Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. latin 1240; see texts below), and a true Easter play,—that is, a presentation of the story by means of action and impersonation,—is extant in a document composed, probably, in the period 965-975, and preserved in a manuscript of the period 1020-30 (see Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, Vol. II, pp. 306-307, concerning the *Regularis Concordia* of St. Ethelwold). The dramatic Christmas trope *Quem quæritis in præsepe* is not extant in texts earlier than the eleventh century (see Young, in *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, Vol. XVII, pp. 300-311), and the earliest true plays of the Christmas season are found in manuscripts of the eleventh century (see Young, in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 68-70).

minutive prose dialogue of which the simplest² form runs as follows:

Item³ DE RESURRECTIONE DOMINI.

INTERROGATIO:

Quem queritis in sepulchro, Christicole?

RESPONSIUS:

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o caelicolae.

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

RESURREXI.⁴

This small composition is easily identified as one of some thousands of literary intrusions into the canonical text of the Roman liturgy which are technically called *trope*s. In the present case the trope is attached, obviously, to the Mass, and serves as a mere introduction to the Introit of the Mass of Easter, of which the first word is *Resurrexi*, and of which the complete form is the following:

Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum, alleluia: posuisti super me manum tuam, alleluia: mirabilis facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia.

² Although this is the *simplest*, and, indeed, the *oldest* form of the trope, the manuscripts that preserve it are not quite so old as the manuscript (Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. latin 1240) that preserves a derived form. These considerations are discussed below, pp. 12-13.

³ The word *Item* indicates the fact that this trope is one of a series of tropes for the Introit of the Mass of Easter.

⁴ St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, ms. 484, *Troparium Sangallense* sicc. x, p. 111. The last word *Resurrexi* is the first word of the Easter Introit. It is followed immediately by the rubric *Aliter*, indicating the beginning of a fresh trope. The rime, and the arrangement of the lines of the trope as here printed, should mislead no one into thinking that this piece is other than prose. See C. Blume, *Repertorium Repertorii (Hymnologische Beiträge*, Vol. II), Leipzig, 1901,

Psalmus: Domine probasti me, et cognovisti me: tu cognovisti sessionem meam, et resurrectionem meam.

Versus: Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto. Sicut erat in principio, et nunc et semper, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.⁵

The trope before us, however, did not always attach itself to the Mass. It has been justly observed that *Quem queritis in sepulchro* had a *double* association and development within the liturgy of Easter: first as an appendage to the Introit of the Mass, and secondly as an intrusion in the Canonical Office, immediately before the *Te Deum* at the end of Matins.⁶ Of these two developments the second, called *Visitatio Sepulchri*, has been assiduously studied. More than twenty-five years ago Professor Carl Lange published some two hundred texts illustrating the growth of *Quem queritis* into a true drama in the office of Matins, and expounded the chief stages of this development in a lucid commentary.⁷ The few scores of similar texts more recently published have merely confirmed the more important part of Lange's exposition.⁸

⁵The manner in which this Introit was rendered will be discussed below. See p. 16.

⁶The best analysis of this double development is that presented by Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, Vol. II, pp. 9-36.

⁷See C. Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*, Munich, 1887.

⁸Such texts have been published by N. C. Brooks, in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, Vol. L (1908), pp. 297-312; *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. VIII (1909), pp. 464-488; *id.*, Vol. x (1911), pp. 191-196; by S. Windakiewicza, in the bulletin of the *Krakauer Akademie*, Vol. XXXIII (1902); *id.*, Vol. XXXIV (1903), pp. 339-356; by H. Pfeiffer, in *Jahrbuch des Stiftes Klosterneuburg*, Vol. I (1908), pp. 3-56; by P. Stotzner, *Osterfeiern*, Programm No. 594, Zwickau, 1901; and by the present writer in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XXIV (1909), pp. 297-329; *id.*, Vol. XXV (1910), p. 351; *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, Vol. XVI (1909), pp. 899-944; *Modern Philology*, Vol. VI (1908), pp. 221-222.

It appears, however, that the other, and earlier, development of *Quem quæritis*,—as a trope attached to the Introit of the Mass,—has never received adequate study. From the few examples of the trope that have been published, the importance of this dramatic germ has, to be sure, been duly discerned; but in the absence of any considerable number of published texts,⁹ it has been impossible to expound completely the fundamental factor in the development of the Easter play, and the very embryo of modern drama.

In the following pages, then, I present the texts of all the Easter *Quem quæritis* Introit tropes that are known to me, and try to trace the growth of this germ toward drama while it remained attached to the Mass.¹⁰ In the course of

⁹ Texts are given chiefly by the following: (1) L. Gautier (*Le Monde*, Paris, August 17, 1872, p. 2; *Les Tropes*, Paris, 1886, pp. 216, 217, 220); (2) G. Milchsack (*Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*, Wolfenbüttel, 1880, pp. 38-39); (3) C. Lange (*op. cit.*, pp. 22-23); (4) W. H. Frere (*The Winchester Troper*, London, 1894, p. 176). The text printed on p. 17 I do not regard as a trope of the Introit. The inadequacy of Frere's method of editing,—particularly apparent in the present connection,—is exposed without reserve by Blume in *Analecta Hymnica*, Vol. XLVII, pp. 31-36); (5) Clemens Blume (*Analecta Hymnica*, Vol. XLIX, pp. 9-10). Although certain of these scholars possess an extensive and masterly knowledge of tropes in general, all five writers combined have printed scarcely more than a half dozen texts of *Quem quæritis in sepulchro* that are both correct and intelligible. Lange, writing without an acquaintance with Gautier's epoch-making investigations, seems to have been unaware of a difference between the *Troparium* and the *Graduale* or the *Liber Responsalis*. None of these writers distinguishes clearly between the use of *Quem quæritis* as a trope of the Introit and as a dramatic intrusion at the end of Matins. Upon the basis of the few texts provided by these investigators, however, Chambers (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 9 ff.) makes this distinction with admirable lucidity.

¹⁰ My possession of most of the new texts offered in this study was made possible by the generosity of Reverend H. M. Bannister, of Rome, and Le Révérend Père Dom G. M. Beyssac, O. S. B., of

this procedure I shall treat the following divisions of the subject: (1) the simplest form of the trope, its sources, and its provenience; (2) the addition of sentences of mere liturgical significance; (3) the addition of sentences of dramatic, as well as of liturgical, significance; (4) the conscious adoption of a *mise en scène*; (5) the development of the trope into true drama while still attached to the Introit; and (6) other associations of the *Quem queritis* formula with the Easter Mass.

I

Returning, then, to the simplest form of the trope, we may examine a text quite similar to that given above:

ALITER<p. 247>

Interrogatio:

Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpicticolae?

Responsio:

Ithcum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

Resurrexi.¹¹

That this text constitutes a dialogue appears both from the content and from the rubrics. The dialogue clearly concerns the visit of the Maries to Christ's empty sepul-

Quarr Abbey. I cannot adequately thank these teachers of mine for constant gifts of materials and for untiring instruction. I should, however, absolve them from all responsibility for my particular treatment of the materials in the present study.

¹¹ St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, ms. 381, Troparium Sangallense sec. xi, pp. 246-247. The last word *Resurrexi* is followed immediately by the rubric *Aliter*.

chre, the first sentence consisting of the angelic challenge, the second, of the reply of the Maries, and the third (*Non est hic*), of the angelic assurance. The omission of a rubric before the third sentence would seem to suggest that the second and third sentences were delivered by the same person, or persons. From other texts, however, we infer that this undramatic form of rendition did not obtain,¹² and that the third sentence was delivered by the person, or persons, who delivered the first. In the text before us we have no indication as to how the parts were distributed: whether between two half-choirs, or between a cantor,—or cantors,—and the whole choir, or between two cantors,—or groups of cantors.¹³

Since we now have in hand the simplest form of our trope, we may conveniently inquire as to its sources. Turning to the Vulgate we find the following three accounts of the visit of the Maries to the empty sepulchre: ¹⁴

¹² See the texts from the following manuscripts, printed below: Zürich, ms. Rheinau 97; Verona ms. 107; Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. latin 779; *ibid.*, ms. latin 118; Ivrea ms. 60; Monza ms. C. 13/76; Monte Cassino ms. 127; Benevento mss. 27 and 28; Oxford, ms. Douce 222; Piacenza ms. 65.

¹³ As to the manner in which such a trope was sung we derive a certain amount of information from ms. latin 9498 (Paris, Bibl. Nat.), one of twenty volumes of liturgical documents compiled by J. de Voisin in the seventeenth century. On page 17 of ms. 9498, in describing a thirteenth-century *Ordinarium* from the Abbey of St. Denis, de Voisin quotes the following concerning the singing of the trope that follows upon the procession (*Vidi aquam*) after Terce:

Post processionem ascendant infra sancta sanctorum quidam beneficantes, alii in dextro latere et alii in sinistro absistentes, tropas bene et honorifice conjubilantes scilicet: *Quem quæritis, et sibi inuicem respondentes. Et cum intonuerint: Quia surrexit, dicens Patri, statim archicantor et duo socii ejus assistentes in choro incipiunt Officium.*

¹⁴ On the relation of *Quem quæritis* to the Vulgate see H. Anz,

MATT. xxviii, 5-7, 10. MARC. xvi, 5-7. LUC. xxiv, 4-6.

5. Respondens autem angelus, dixit monumentum, vide mulieribus: Nolite timere vos; scio enim quod Jesum qui crucifixus est, queritis.

5. Et introeuntes in terram duxerunt juvenem sedentem in dextris cooperatum stola candida, et obstupuerunt.

4. Et factum est, dum mente consternata essent de isto, ecce duo viri steterunt secus illas in ueste fulgenti.

6. Non est hic; surrexit enim, sicut dixit. Venite, et videte locum, ubi positus erat Dominus.

6. Qui dicit illis: Nolite expavescere; autem, et declinarentur Iesum queritis Nazarenum, crucifixum; surrexit, non est hic, ecce locus ubi posuerunt eum.

5. Cum timerent vultum in terram, dixerunt ad illas: Quid queritis viventem cum mortuis?

7. Et cito euntes, dicitе discipulis ejus quia surrexit; et ecce præcedet vos in Galilæam; ibi eum videbitis, sicut dixit Jesus: Nolite timere; vobis.

7. Sed ite, dicitе surrexit; recordamini discipulis ejus, et Petrum, quia præcedit vos in Galilæam; ibi eum Galilæa esset.

6. Non est hic sed qualiter locutus est vobis, cum adhuc in tis: ecce prædicti vobis.

10. Tunc ait illis videbitis, sicut dixit Jesus: Nolite timere; vobis. ite, nuntiate fratribus meis ut eant in Galilæam, ubi me videbunt.

It will be observed, in the first place, that none of the Gospels recounts the visit of the Maries in dialogue form. In only one account, that of St. Luke, is there an angelic interrogation, and this interrogation is far from identical with that in the trope. It is clear, moreover, that in none of the accounts do the Maries explicitly reply to the angelic address. It appears, then, that although the Vulgate provides the content and some of the words of the trope, it does not provide the essentials of dialogue form. It might be suggested that the influence of St. Luke's version is to

Die lateinischen Magierspiele, Leipzig, 1905, p. 38; Gautier, *Les Tropes*, p. 219, note 5; Milchsack, pp. 10, 27, 30-31, 116; A. Schönbach, in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, Vol. xxxii (1888), p. 85; Chambers, Vol. II, pp. 9, 28.

be seen in the plural form *celicole* (==*cælicolæ*), since only in the Third Gospel are two angels mentioned. The plural form *celicole*, however, is almost certainly due to the rime with the inevitable plural *Xpicticole*.¹⁵

As another possible source we may turn to the liturgy itself, which the trope-writer was engaged in embellishing. During the Easter season he shared in the singing of such suggestive antiphons as the following:¹⁶

Antiphona: Jesum quem quæritis, non est hic, sed surrexit. . . .

Antiphona: Nolite expavescere, Jesum Nazarenum quæritis crucifixum; non est hic, surrexit, alleluia.

Antiphona: Jesum qui crucifixus est quæritis, alleluia; non est hic, surrexit enim sicut dixit vobis, alleluia.

Likewise familiar were the following two well-known responsories:

(1) Responsorium: Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere; scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis. Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia. Versus: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam.

(2) Responsorium: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia. Versus: Ecce præcedet vos in Galilæam, ibi eum videbitis, sicut dixit vobis. Jam.

In view of the somewhat complex nature of the responsory as a type, it may be well to indicate the normal distribution of parts in the singing of the two responsories

¹⁵ See Gaston Paris, in *Journal des Savants*, 1892, p. 684.

¹⁶ These liturgical pieces are conveniently found in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. LXXXVIII, col. 769-774. Here may be quoted also the *Offertorium* of the Mass for Easter Monday: Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et dixit mulieribus: Quem quæritis surrexit, sicut dixit, alleluia. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* LXXXVIII, 678.)

before us.¹⁷ In accordance with the prevailing mediæval practice, the first responsory (*Angelus Domini descendit*) would have been sung in one of two ways, as follows:

(a) Cantor *Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere; scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis. Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.*

Chorus: *Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere; scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis. Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.*

Cantor: *Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis?*

Chorus: *Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere: scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis. Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.*

Cantor: *Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sœcula sœculorum, Amen.*

Chorus: *Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.*

Cantor: *Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere: scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis. Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.*

Chorus: *Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere: scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis. Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.*

(b) Cantor: *Angelus Domini descendit de cœlo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere; scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis.*

¹⁷ As to the singing of antiphons and responsories see P. Wagner, *Origine et Développement du Chant Liturgique*, Tournai, 1904, pp. 135-163.

Chorus: Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.

Cantor: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis?

Chorus: Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.

Cantor: Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sæcula sæculorum, Amen.

Chorus: Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.

Cantor: Angelus Domini descendit de celo, et accedens revolvit lapidem; et super eum sedit, et dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere; scio enim quia crucifixum quæritis.

Chorus: Jam surrexit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alleluia.

Similarly, the second of the responsories (*Angelus Domini locutus est*) would take one of the following forms:

(a) Cantor: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.

Chorus: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.

Cantor: Ecce præcedet vos in Galilæam, ibi eum videbitis, sicut dixit vobis.

Chorus: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.

Cantor: Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sæcula sæculorum, Amen.

Chorus: Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.

Cantor: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.

Chorus: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis? Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.

(b) Cantor: Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis?

Chorus: *Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.*
 Cantor: *Ecce præcedet vos in Galilæam; ibi eum videbitis, sicut dixit vobis.*
 Chorus: *Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.*
 Cantor: *Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sæcula sæculorum, Amen.*
 Chorus: *Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.*
 Cantor: *Angelus Domini locutus est mulieribus dicens: Quem quæritis, an Jesum quæritis?*
 Chorus: *Jam surrexit, venite et videte, alleluia, alleluia.*

An examination of these liturgical pieces reveals, once again, certain of the expressions found in the trope *Quem quæritis*, but nothing approaching the essential dialogue. The liturgy of Easter presents the necessary content, but not the desired form.

In another part of the liturgy, however, in an irrelevant context, appear certain passages that may have served the trope-writer as a nucleus. During Mass on Good Friday he stood for an impressive hour and listened to the Deacon's chanting of the Passion according to St. John.¹⁸ In the course of this chastening ceremony he heard the following:

(1) [Christus]: *Quem quæritis?*
 [Narrator]: *Responderunt ei:*
 [Judæi]: *Jesum Nazarenum.*¹⁹

¹⁸ *John xviii, 1—xix, 42.*

¹⁹ *John xviii, 4-5.* The names of the speakers, in brackets, are given merely for the sake of intelligibility. They should not be mistaken as meaning that in the singing of the Passion each of the three utterances was assigned to a separate singer. Until the fifteenth century, the Passion was sung throughout by one Deacon. Concerning the singing of the liturgical *Passiones* see an article by the present writer, in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. xxv (1910), pp. 311-333,—especially p. 315.

(2) [Christus]: *Quem quæritis?*
 [Narrator]: *Illi autem dixerunt:*
 [Judæi]: *Jesum Nazarenum.*²⁰

Since in the chanting of each of these passages, each separate utterance was marked by a change of voice on the part of the Deacon, the force of the question and answer could not escape the listener.

Whether or not any of these Biblical or liturgical passages served the author of *Quem quæritis* as a starting-point, none of them approaches the finished dramatic form of the trope itself. *Quem quæritis in sepulchro* must be regarded, then, as an original composition.²¹

In view of this fact, we may well inquire concerning the home, the date, and the name of the author of this productive little dramatic piece. The oldest extant text of our trope is found in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. latin 1240, written for the monastery of St. Martial at Limoges within the period 933-936.²² This text, however, does not

²⁰ John xviii, 7.

²¹ This fact is recognized, upon the basis of one consideration or another, by Milchsack (*op. cit.*, pp. 31-32), Gaston Paris (*Journal des Savants*, 1892, p. 684), and W. Meyer (*op. cit.*, p. 34). Lange (*op. cit.*, pp. 19, 168) seems to assume that the trope *Quem quæritis* was a fundamental part of the liturgy, and that we should no more seek a definite author for such a piece than for the traditional antiphons and responsories. Lange's error results from his lack of information concerning tropes as such,—information quite inaccessible, indeed, before the publication of Gautier's monograph, mentioned above. The tropes were never officially recognized as part of the liturgy, and the *troparium* was never an official service-book. The *troparia* were always relatively few in number, and they merely preserved the numerous musico-literary embellishments with which ambitious, but misguided, religious communities corrupted the liturgy of Rome.

²² As to the date see the facts advanced by Reverend H. M. Bannister in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. II (1901), pp. 420 ff., and in *Analecta Hymnica*, Vol. XLVII, pp. 22-23.

show the trope in its simplest form. This *simplest* form,—and we may confidently say also, *original* form,—I have already printed above from two St. Gall manuscripts (Nos. 484 and 381). Although the older of these two St. Gall manuscripts (No. 484) cannot be assigned to a date earlier than the year 950,²³ the version of *Quem quæritis* preserved in it must have originated at a date earlier than the period 933-936, from which we have a text of an elaborated, and hence derived, version.²⁴ If, then, the original version of our trope is located at St. Gall, and if it arose at a date somewhat anterior to 933-936,—say *circa* 900,—we can hardly hesitate to mention as the probable author, the famous Tutilo, who was actively engaged in trope-writing at St. Gall about the year 900, and who was still living in 912.²⁵ It is an interesting fact that St. Gall ms. 484, which preserves the earliest text of the simplest version of *Quem quæritis in sepulchro*, contains two tropes which are unquestionably the work of Tutilo,²⁶ and one of which, *Hodie cantandus est*, is strikingly dramatic in form.²⁷

Having considered the possible sources, provenience, and authorship of the simplest version of *Quem quæritis*, we may continue our observations upon the text itself, two examples of which have already been printed above.²⁸ Minor variations from this text are seen in the following:

²³ See Bannister, *Journal of Theological Studies*, II, 420 ff.

²⁴ This reasoning seems to accord with the general view expressed by Blume in *Analecta Hymnica*, Vol. XLIX, p. 10.

²⁵ See Gautier, pp. 35-36, *et passim*.

²⁶ See Gautier, p. 34.

²⁷ For an account of the trope *Hodie cantandus est*, with texts, see an article by the present writer in *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, Vol. XVII (1912), pp. 362-368.

²⁸ From St. Gall mss. 484 and 381. See pp. 2 and 5.

<TROPUS>

1. Quem queritis in sepulchro, ho cristicole?
2. Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum.
3. Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
4. ite, nuntiate quia surrexit.
5. Resurrexi et adhuc.²⁹

Variant:

Vercelli, Bibl. Capit., ms. 162, Graduale-Troparium Vercellense
 sœc. xii, fol. 191v.—1. sepulchro ho cristicole] sepulchro o pīcole.—
 2. Hiesum] Ihm.—4. nuntiate] nunciate.—5. et adhuc] omitted.

In this version one notes the shortening of the second sentence (*Hiesum nazarenum*), and the consequent removal of the rime *christicole: cælicole*.³⁰ The division of the dialogue in this version is secured from another text:

IN PASCHA INTROITUM

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o Xpisticole?

Versus: Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum.

Versus: Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;³¹
 ite, nunciate quia surrexit.³²

Antiphona: Resurrexi.³³

²⁹ Vercelli, Bibl. Capit., ms. 146, Graduale-Troparium Vercellense sœc. xi, fol. 109r. The text printed above is immediately preceded, in the manuscript, by a prose for the Purification, and is immediately followed by the words *Ecce Pater cunctis*, which begin a fresh trope of the Introit.

³⁰ That this variation is not merely scribal seems likely from the evidence of three manuscripts: Vercelli 146, Vercelli 162, and, as printed below, Vercelli 161.

³¹ MS. prediscerat.

³² MS. susrexit.

³³ Vercelli, Bibl. Capit., ms. 161, Graduale-Troparium sœc. xii, fol. 121r. The text printed above is immediately followed, in the manuscript, by the words *Ecce Pater cunctis*, indicating a new trope of the Introit.

In the following text the introductory trope itself shows no important textual variations:

IN DIE PASCHAE

Interrogatio:

Quem quēritis in sepulchro, Xpisticolē?

Responsio:

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o cēlicolē.

Interrogantes:

Non est hic; surrexit sicut prēdixerat.

Ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

AD MISSAM: Hodie processit leo fortis sepulchro, ob cuius uictoriam gaudebant cēlestes ministri; ideo *et* nos lētemur canentes. *Resurrexi.* Principe inferni deuicto, claustris ac reseratis. Et adhuc *<tecum sum>*, *alleluia.* A quo numquam recessi, licet in carne paruerim. Posuisti *<super>* me. Quem tu solus *et* solum genuisti, Deus ante sēcula. *Manum <tuam>*, *alleluia.* Quia iussu tuo mortem degustavi. *Mirabilis <facta>* est. Cui nulla sapientia mundi est equanda. *Scientia <tua>*, *alleluia.* Quod tali uictoria uictorem tumidum strauisti, *alleluia.* *<Psalmus>*: *Domine probasti <me, et cognovisti me: tu cognovisti sessionem meam, et resurrectionem> meam.* Qui me de morte *<p. 17>* turpi assumptum sedere tecum in gloria facis. *<Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sēcula sēculorum>*, *Amen.* Quē angelis est ueneranda cunctis *atque* mortalibus. *Resurrexi.*³⁴

³⁴ Zürich, Kantonsbibliothek, ms. Rhenoviense 97, Troparium San-gallense (?) sēc. xi in., pp. 16-17. The last word *Resurrexi* indi-

In this case the dialogue is clearly indicated by the rubrics. The connection of *Quem quæritis* with the Introit itself, however, is not quite clear. It may be that the trope introduced by the rubric *Ad Missam* is to be regarded merely as a continuation of *Quem quæritis*; or possibly *Quem quæritis* may be used merely as a processional, and is to be understood as a liturgical piece quite separate from the succeeding trope.³⁵ In any case, for an understanding of the complete text before us one should have a clear notion of the manner in which the Introit itself was rendered. The distribution of parts most commonly observed, perhaps, from the year 900 onwards, may be seen in the following:³⁶

[Chorus primus] Antiphona: Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum,
alleluia; posuisti super me manum tuam, alleluia;
mirabilis facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia.

[Chorus secundus] Psalmus: Domine, probasti me, et cognovisti me;
tu cognovisti sessionem meam, et resurrectionem
meam.

[Chorus primus] Doxologia: Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui
Saneto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper,
et in sæcula sæculorum, Amen.

[Chorus secundus] Antiphona: Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum,
alleluia; posuisti super me manum tuam, alleluia;
mirabilis facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia.

cates the repetition of the antiphon of the Introit. This text has been previously published by Professor N. C. Brooks, in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. x, pp. 191-192. My text, which differs from that of Professor Brooks only in trifling details, is printed from a copy generously made for me by Herr J. Werner, Librarian of the Kantonsbibliothek, Zürich.

³⁵ Concerning the use of *Quem quæritis* as a processional see below, pp. 49 ff.

³⁶ The various practices connected with the singing of the Introit are explained by P. Wagner, *Origine et Développement du Chant Liturgique*, Tournai, 1904, pp. 68-78.

This expansion of the Introit reveals the extent of the troping in the manuscript before us. The rubric *Ad Missam* is followed by a complete internal trope of the Introit. Not only are the parts of the Introit separated by the trope, one from another, but even the separated parts are themselves disrupted.

II.

So far in our observations we have encountered no important variations in the four sentences of the original trope, and we have noticed no increase in content. We must now consider a few examples which show a small textual addition. The following text is typical:

IN RESURRECTIONE

<H>ora est, psallite; iubet dominus canere; eia
dicite!

Quem queritis in sepulcro, cristicole?

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, celicole.

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit, dicentes:

Resurrexi.³⁷

The addition (*Hora est*) here takes the form of an exclamatory introduction to the original trope *Quem queritis*. By Gautier this accretion is succinctly characterized as the trope of a trope,—“le trope d’un trope.”³⁸ It should be observed, moreover, that the introductory pas-

³⁷ Vich (Spain), Bibl. Capit., ms. 111, Troparium Vicense sæc. xii, fol. 2r. The trope does not extend within the Introit.

³⁸ Gautier, p. 226.

sage does not unite organically with the original text to form an extension of the dialogue,—that it constitutes a *liturgical* rather than a *dramatic* addition.³⁹

A slight variation in the new form of the trope is seen in the following:

1. TROPI IN *Dominica de Pascha*
2. Hora est, surgite; iubet dominus canere; eia dicite!
3. Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?
4. Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
5. Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
6. ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes:
7. Resur<r>exi.⁴⁰

Variant:

Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, ms. 1741 (C. iv. 2), Troparium Nonantulense scc. xi, fol. 75r-75v.

1. Tropi Dom in pasc.
6. nuntiate] nunciate.

From another manuscript we have a similar text, provided with rubrics:

³⁹ That the introductory formula *Hora est* was used elsewhere than in connection with *Quem queritis in sepulchro* is shown by the following trope of the Introit of Pentecost, from Bibl. Nat., ms. latin 903, Graduale-Troparium Sancti Aredii scc. xii, fol. 155r:

In die sancto Pentecosten.

Hora est, psallite; iubet Dominus canere; eya dicite.

Psallite, fratres mi omnes, una uoce dicentes:

Hodie descendit Spiritus Sanctus uelut ignis super apostolos, et eorum pectoribus inuisibiliter penetrauit; docuit eos omnis linguis loqui in eius honore dulce; carmina omnes decantae; dicite:

Spiritus Domini.

⁴⁰ Rome, Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele, ms. 1343 (Sessor. 62), Troparium Nonantulense scc. xi in., fol. 28v.

IN DIE SANCTO⁴¹ PA<S>CHE AD MISSAM SINT OMNES
ORDINATI IN CHORO, *et* INCIPiat CANTOR ITA DICENS:

Hora est, psallite;⁴² iubet dominus canere; eia
dicite!

Respondet SCOLA:

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o cristicole?

Respondet CANTOR:

Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Respondet SCOLA:

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit, dicentes:

Resurrexi.⁴³

In this case the dialogue is divided between the choir (Scola) and a single singer (Cantor). After the cantor has sung the introductory liturgical summons, he is interrogated by the choir, replies, and then receives the angelic assurance. The choir in uttering the words of the scriptural angel (or two), and the cantor in answering with the words of the several *Christicole*, are both precluding anything approaching dramatic appropriateness in the assignment of parts.

III

Far more important than the mere liturgical introduction to the trope that we have just noticed, are a considerable number of textual additions which either consti-

⁴¹ MS. scm.

⁴² MS. spallite.

⁴³ Verona, Bibl. Capit., ms. 107, Troparium Mantuanum sec. xi, fol. 11r. The last word *Resurrexi* is followed immediately, in the manuscript, by the rubric *Item alia*, indicating the beginning of a fresh trope.

tute definite extensions of the dialogue, or, at least, provide new dramatic possibilities. An addition of this latter sort is seen in the following:

Dominicum DIEM Sanctum PASCHE
TROPHI <fol. 102v>

Quem queritis in sepulchro, cristicole?
Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum,⁴⁴ o celicole.
Non est hic, surrexit enim sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit dicentes:
Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurexit leo fortis,
Xpistus filius Dei; Deo gracias, dicite eia, *alleluia*.
Resurrexi.⁴⁵

The passage beginning *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus* constitutes a natural dramatic extension of the trope, an extension which provides a fresh utterance for the *Christicole*.

A similar text appears as follows:

IN DIE DOMINICO SANCTO PASCHA
TROPUS

Quem quaeritis in sepulchro, Christicolae?
Responsio:
Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o coelicolae.
Non est hic, surrexit sicut praeceperat;
ite, nunciate quia⁴⁶ surrexit.

⁴⁴ MS. crucifixum.

⁴⁵ Modena, Bibl. Capit., ms. O. 1. 7., *Troparium Ravennatense* sœc. xi-xii, fol. 102r-102v. The last word *Resurrexi* (ms. *Resurrexit*) is followed immediately by the rubric *Aliter*.

⁴⁶ MS. sicut.

Responsio:

Resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo
fortis; Deo gratias, dicite Alleluia.

ANTIPHONA: Resurrexi et adhuc tecum sum,
Alleluia. **Psalmus:** Domine probasti me.⁴⁷

The rubrics are here somewhat uncertain as to the division of parts, and at best we can allow only slight authority to a text of which we have only a seventeenth-century copy.

The interest of the following text lies in the continuation of the trope within the Introit:

DE PASCHA Domini

Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?
Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
Non est hic, surrexit sicut locutus est;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit.

Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo fortis, Xpistus filius Dei; Deo gratias, dicite eya. Resurrexi. Victor triumpho potenti. Et adhuc <tecum sum, alleluia>. Celi, terre, adque maris sceptra tenes. Posuisti <super me manum tuam, alleluia>. Glorificasti me deifice. Mirabilis facta est. In omni uirtute. Scientia tua. <fol. 19^r> Qua cuncta gubernas. Psalmus: Domine probasti me <et cognovisti me: tu cognovisti sessionem meam, et resurrectionem meam. Gloria Patri>. Preclara adest dies Xpistus quare surgens, hoste triumphato, uitam dedit mundo, cuius uoce summo Patri gratulantes cum propheta proclamemus omnes ita: Resurrexi.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 9508, *Miscellanea liturgica sæc. xvii*, fol. 179 r ("Ex Missali Corbeiensi ms. num. 622 sæculi xi"). There is no internal troping of the Introit.

⁴⁸ Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, ms. 1169, *Troparium Aeduense anni*

At this point our attention falls naturally upon the earliest extant text of the trope *Quem quæritis*:

TROPHI IN PASCHE

Psallite regi magno, deuicto mortis imperio!

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o Xpisticole?

Responsio:

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Responsio:

Non est hic, surrexit *sicut* ipse dixit;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit.

Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo fortis, Christus filius Dei, Deo gratias, dicit eia! <Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum, alleluia>. Dormiui, Pater et surgam diluculo, et somnus meus dulcis est michi. Posuisti super me manum tuam, alleluia>. Ita, Pater, sic placuit ante te, ut moriendo mortis mors fuisse, morsus inferni, et mundo uita. Mirabilis <facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia>. Qui abscondisti hec sa-
pientibus, et reuelasti paruulis, alleluia.⁴⁹

As we have already noticed above,⁵⁰ this famous manuscript from Limoges, although it presents the *oldest* extant

996-1024, fol. 18v-19r. The last word *Resurrexi* indicates the repetition of the Introit. *Resurrexi* is followed immediately by the rubric *Alia*.

⁴⁹ Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. latin 1240, Troparium Martialis sæc. x (anni 933-936), fol. 30v. The text above is immediately followed by the rubric *Item* introducing another trope. Inexact or mutilated texts of the trope printed above are given by E. DuMénil (*Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne*, Paris, 1897, p. 97, note 1), Milchsack (pp. 38-39), Lange (pp. 22-23), and W. H. Frere (*The Winchester Tropes*, London, 1894, p. 176). In my reading of the manuscript I am forced to dissent, also, from the critical notes provided by Blume in *Analecta Hymnica*, Vol. XLIX, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁰ See pp. 12-13.

text of *Quem queritis*, does not preserve the trope in its *simplest* form. In addition to a fresh introductory formula of a liturgical nature, this text provides the familiar concluding passage, *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus*. As to the delivery of this concluding passage the rubrics give no precise information. The continuation of the trope within the Introit is noteworthy.

At this stage of our survey the following text is relevant:

IN PASCHA

Hora est, psallite; iube dominus canere; eia dicite!
 Quem queritis in sepulchro christicole?
 Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
 Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
 ite, nunciate quia surrexit, dicentes:
 Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit <fol.
 34^r> leo fortis, Christus, filius Dei; Deo gracias, dicite
 eia! *Antiphona: Resurrexi*⁵¹ *et adhuc tecum <sum,*
alleluia>. Gaudeamus omnes, resurrexit Dominus. Po-
 suisti super me <manum tuam, alleluia>. Vicit leo de
 tribu Iuda, radix Iesse. Mirabilis facta est⁵² <scientia
 tua, alleluia, alleluia>.⁵³

Both the introductory liturgical formula in this text, and the concluding passage of the trope, immediately before the Introit, are now sufficiently familiar.

Fresh additions to the original trope are seen in the following:

⁵¹ MS. Resurrexit.

⁵² Followed immediately in the manuscript by the rubric *Aliter*, indicating the beginning of a new trope.

⁵³ Apt, Archives of the Basilica of St. Anne, ms. 4, *Troparium sec. x*, fol. 33v-34r.

TROPOS IN RESURRECTIONE

1. Quem queritis in sepulchro, o Xristicole?
2. Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
3. Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
4. ite <fol. 21^v>, nunciate quia surrexit.
5. Alleluia, ad sepulcrum residens angelus
6. nunciat resurrexisse Xristum.
7. En ecce completum est illud quod olim ipse
8. per prophetam dixerat ad Patrem taliter inquiens:
9. Resur<rexi>.⁵⁴

Variants:

Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1120, Troparium S. Martini Lemovicensis sœc. xi in., fol. 20v-21r. A.—*Ibid.*, ms. lat. 1121, Troparium S. Martialis Lemovicensis sœc. xi in., fol. 11v-12r. B.—*Ibid.*, ms. lat. 1084, Troparium S. Martialis Lemovicensis sœc. x, fol. 64v-65r. C.—Huesca, Bibl. Capit. ms. 4, Troparium Oscense sœc. xi-xii, fol. 124r-124v. D.

1. sepulchro] sepulcrho C; sepulcro D. Xristicole] Xristicole A B; cristicole B.
2. Iesum] Ihessum A; Hiesum B; Thesum C D.
3. predixerat] praedixerat B.
4. nunciate] nuntiate B C.
5. Alleluia] Aeuia C D. sepulcrum] sepulchrum A B; sepulchrum C.
6. nunciat resurrexisse Xristum] nuntiat resurrexisse Xristum A B; nunciat resurrexisse cristum C; nunciat resurrexisset Xpm D.
8. per] omitted C.
9. Resurrexi] Resurrexit A.

Concerning the two added sentences *Alleluia, ad sepulcrum* and *En ecce completum est* Chambers observes, "The appended portion of narrative makes the trope

⁵⁴ Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1119, Troparium S. Augustini Lemovicensis sœc. xi, fol. 21v-21r. In connection with this text should be listed the similar, but incomplete, texts in Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 909, Troparium Martialense sœc. xi, fol. 21v-22r, and *Ibid.*, Nouv. Acq. latin 1871, Troparium Moissiacense sœc. xi, fol. 13v.

slightly less dramatic,"⁵⁵ and Gautier remarks, "Quelques lignes y sont ajoutées aux précédentes et semblent continuer discrètement une rubrique de mise en scène."⁵⁶ Obviously these sentences do mark a discontinuance of the dialogue; for although they constitute a continuation of the part of the *Christicolæ*, they must be regarded not as a second reply to the *Cælicolæ*, but either as a mere exclamation, or as an exultant address to an audience.

A similar text is seen in the following:

IN PASCA AD MISSAM

Quem queritis in sepulcro, o Xpisticole?
 Iesum nazarenum crucifixum,⁵⁷ o celicole.
 Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
 ite, nunciate in Galileam dicentes:
 Alleluia, ad sepulcrum residens angelus nunciat resur-
 rexisse Xpistum.

En ecce completum est illud quod olim ipse per prophetam dixerat, ad Patrem taliter inquiens:

Resurrexi.⁵⁸

The passage *ite, nunciate in Galileam* of the third sentence seems to have been composed under the direct influence

⁵⁵ Chambers, Vol. II, p. 10.

⁵⁶ Gautier, p. 220.

⁵⁷ MS. crucifisum.

⁵⁸ Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 887, Troparium S. Martini(?) Lemovicensis sæc. xi, fol. 19r. The last word *Resurrexi* is followed immediately by the rubric *Tropi*, introducing the following series of tropes of the Easter Introit: (1) *Psallite regi magno . . .* (2) *Factus homo tua iussa pater . . .* (3) *Ecce pater cunctis ut iusserat . . .* (4) *Aurea lux remeat Ihesus . . .* (5) *Iam tua iussa pater . . .* For the texts see *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, Vol. XLIX, Leipzig, 1906, pp. 54-55. Any one of these five tropes may have been used as an internal trope of the Introit *Resurrexi*, in continuation of the introductory trope *Quem queritis in sepulchro*.

of the Vulgate: *ite, nuntiate fratribus meis ut eant in Galilæam (Matt. xxviii, 10).*

As to the distribution of parts in this form of trope, the following text gives a slight indication:

IN DIE SANCTO PASCHE STACIO AD SANCTUM PETRUM.

ITEM TROPOS IN DIE

Hora est, psallite; iuba dompnus canere; eia, eia,
dicite!

Quem queritis in sepulcro, o Xpisticole?

Respondent:⁵⁹

Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Respondent:

Non est hic,⁶⁰ surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite nunciate quia surrexit.

Respondent:

Alleluia, ad sepulcrum residens angelus nunciat re-
surrexisse Xpistum.

En ecce completum est illud quod olim ipse per pro-
phetam dixerat, ad Patrem taliter inquiens:

Resurrexi.⁶¹

A somewhat similar text may be seen in the following:

⁵⁹ In speaking of the rubric *Respondent* as "la plus ancienne didascalie ou indication de mise en scène" Gautier (*Le Monde*, Aug. 17, 1872, p. 2) is scarcely scientific.

⁶⁰ MS. ihc.

⁶¹ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. latin 1118, Troparium S. Martialis Lemovicensis sæc. x (988-996), fol. 40v. The last word *Resurrexi* (ms. *Resurrexit*) is followed immediately by the rubric *Item aliud.*

TROPOS IN RESURRECCIONE DOMINI

Quem queritis in sepulcro, o cristicole?

Responsio:

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o caelicole.

Responsio:

Non est hic, surrexit <fol. 36v> sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit.

Responsio:

Alleluia, ad sepulcrum residens angelus nuntiat
ressurrexisse Xpistum.

Hen ecce conpletum est illud quod olim ipse per
prophetam dixerat, ad Patrem taliter inquiens:

Ressurrexi et.⁶²

In the following text occur fresh additions:

<TROPUS>

Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?

Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit, dicentes:

Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus, eia!

Karrissimi, uerba canite Xpisti.⁶³

Psallite, Fratres, hora est; surrexit Dominus. Eia et
eia!

Ressurrexi.⁶⁴

⁶² Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 779, Graduale Arelatense sœc. xiii, fol. 36r-36v. The last word *et* is followed immediately by the rubric *Alios*.

⁶³ Ms. Xpiste.

⁶⁴ Vercelli, Bibl. Capit., ms. 56, Missale plenum Vercellense (?) sœc. xi-xii, fol. 87v. The trope does not extend within the Introit.

The sentence *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus, eia!* may be a continuation of the part either of the *Cælicolæ* or of the *Christicolæ*. The sentences *Karrissimi, uerba* and *Psallite, Fratres* are clearly liturgical in intention.

A possible elucidation of the text just given appears in the following:

Versus ad Sepulchrum

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o Xpisticole?

Versus: Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Versus: Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes:

Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus, eia!

Tropus

Versus: Karissimi, uerba canite Xpisti.

Versus: Psallite, fratres, hora est, resurrexit Dominus, eia et eia!

Tropus

Xpistus deuicta morte persona uoce preclara Patri dicens. Resur<rexi>. *Versus:* Cum seuiens Iudeorum me circumdaret⁶⁵ turba. Posuisti. *Versus:* Cuneta quia ocu-li<s> maiestatis tue sunt aperta. Mirabi<lis>.⁶⁶

The opening rubric *Versus ad Sepulchrum* and the subsequent rubric *Tropus* would seem to indicate that the trope *Quem queritis* is here detached from the Introit and associated with the Easter Sepulchre. It may be, therefore, that this text and the one preceding, from Ver-

⁶⁵ MS. circumdare.

⁶⁶ Ivrea, Bibl. Capit., ms. 60, Troparium Eporediense sœc. xi in. (1001-1011), fol. 69v. The text above is immediately followed by the complete Introit of Easter, and further tropes.

celli ms. 56, should not be considered tropes of the Introit. As we shall see later, however, the association of a text of *Quem queritis* with the Introit does not preclude its association also with the *sepulchrum*.⁶⁷

In a manner related to the two preceding texts is the following:

TROPHUS

Versus: Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?

Versus: Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Versus: Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes:

Alleluia, resurrexit⁶⁸ hodie, hodie resurrexit leo fortis, Xpistus, filius Dei; <fol. 99r> Deo gratias, dicite eia!

Resurrexi <et adhuc . . . scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia>. Eia, karissimi, uerba canite Xpisti.

Psalmus: Domine probasti me, <et cognovisti . . . et resurrectionem meam. Gloria Patri>. Psallite, fratres, <h>ora est resurrexit Dominus, eia et eia!

Resurrexi.⁶⁹

In the present connection the interest of this text lies in the use of *Karissimi*, *uerba* and *Psallite*, *Fratres* in the internal troping of the Introit.

A smooth transition from dramatic dialogue to liturgical celebration is well accomplished in the following text:

⁶⁷ See below, pp. 42-49.

⁶⁸ MS. resurrexi.

⁶⁹ Monza, Bibl. Capit., ms. C. 13/76, Graduale-Troparium Modœtinum sœc. xi, fol. 98v-99r. The last word *Resurrexi* indicates a repetition of the antiphon of the Introit. In the manuscript this word is followed immediately by a trope of the *Kyrie*. A text similar to that above is to be found in Monza, Bibl. Capit. ms. 77, Graduale-Troparium Modœtinum sœc. xii, fol. 81r.

DIEM Dominicum Sanctum PASCHE.
 STATIO AD Sanctam MARIA <M> MAIORE <M>.
 INTROITUM

Quem queritis in sepulchro Xpisticole?
 Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, celicole.
 Non hic est, surrexit sicut predixerat;
 ite nuntiate quia surrexit.

Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo fortis.
 <D>eo gratias, Deo gratias, Deo gratias; dicite omnes
 alleluia.

Eia, pleps deuota, Deo nunc corde sereno cum Xpisto
 Deo celebremus Pascham canentes:

Resurrexit sicut dixit Dominus; in Galilea apparuit
 dissipulis. Resurrexi⁷⁰ et adhuc tecum sum. Ve tibi,
 Iuda, qui tradidisti Dominum, et cum Iudeis accepisti
 pretium. <Posuisti super me manum tuam, alleluia>. Mulieres qui ad sepulchrum uenera<n>t angelus dixit
 quia surrexit Dominus. Mirabilis <facta est scientia tua,
 alleluia, alleluia>. Cito euntes, dicite, dissipuli, alle-
 luia, alleluia. Resurrexi.⁷¹ Lux mundi, Dominus resur-
 rexit hodie. Possui<sti>. Manus tua,⁷² Domine,
 saluauit mundum hodie. Mirabilis. Scientia Dei mira-
 bile facta est hodie alleluia, alleluia. Resurrexi⁷³ et
 adhuc tecum sum, alleluia. <X>pistus hodie resurrexit
 a mortius, et Patrem glorificans ait. Posuisti super me
 manum tuam, alleluia. Quoniam mors mea facta est
 mundi uita. Mirabilis facta est s<c>ientia tua. Quem
 celum <et> terra simul collaudant dicentes alleluia,
 alleluia. *Psalmus: Domine probasti.*⁷⁴

⁷⁰ MS. Resurrexit.

⁷² MS. tue.

⁷¹ MS. Resurrexit.

⁷³ MS. Resurrexit.

⁷⁴ Rome, Vatican, ms. lat. 4770, Missale plenum Benedictinum S.

Although, in the absence of rubrics; the assignment of parts in this text cannot be demonstrated with certainty, one may be allowed to conjecture that *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus* and, possibly, one or more of the succeeding sentences were understood as extending the rôle of the *Christicolæ*.

The following text has, apparently, no fresh significance except in the link between *Quem quæritis* and the Introit:

1. INCIPIUNT TROPHI IN DIE SANCTO⁷⁵ PASCE
2. ANTE INTROITUM
3. Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?
4. Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o cēlicole.
5. Non est hic, surrexit sicut locutus est;
6. ite; nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes Alleluia.
7. Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus.
8. ITEM TROPHI
9. Pascha nostrum Xpystus est, immolatus agnus est,
10. etenim pascha nostrum immolatus est Xpystus.
11. Hodie exultent iusti; surrexit leo fortis; Deo
12. gratias, dicite eia!
13. ITEM INTROITUM: Resurrexi.⁷⁶

Petri in Aprutio sæc. x-xi, fol. 117r. Part of the text printed above is given by A. Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter: Iter Italicum*, Freiburg, 1896, p. 219, Note 1. The last word of the text as given above is followed, in the manuscript, by a trope of the *Kyrie*.

⁷⁵ MS. scm.

⁷⁶ Turin, Royal Library, ms. G. v. 20, Graduale-Troparium Bobiense sæc. xi, fol. 97r. The trope does not extend within the Introit.

Variant:

Turin, Royal Library, ms. F. iv. 18, *Troparium Bobiense* scc. xii,
fol. 85v.

1. and 2. reduced to one word: <i>Tropi</i> .	11. <i>Hodie</i>] <i>Aliter</i> . <i>Hodie</i> .
4. <i>Hiesum</i>] <i>Versus</i> : <i>Hiesum</i> .	12. <i>gratias</i>] <i>gracias</i> .
5. <i>Non</i>] <i>Versus</i> : <i>Non</i> ; <i>locutus est</i>] <i>predixerat</i> .	13. <i>Item Introitum</i>] omitted.
6. <i>nuntiate</i>] <i>nunciate</i> .	
8. <i>Item Trophi</i>] <i>Aliter</i> .	
9. <i>Xρystus</i>] <i>Xρistus</i> .	
10. <i>Xρystus</i>] <i>Xρistus</i> .	

Although the accretions of the following text defy explanation, this version belongs, apparently, in the present series:

**INCIPIT TROPHUS IN DIEM SANCTUM PASCHE
AD INTROITUM**

Quem queritis in sepulchro, cristicolę?
Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicolę.
Non est hic, surrexit sicut locutus est;
ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes alleluia, alleluia.
Resurrexit Dominus.

Surrexit Cristus, iam non moritur; mors illi ultra non
dominabitur, alleluia, alleluia.

Resurrexit.

Sedit angelus.

Prosa: Crucifixum Dominum laudate.

Nolite.

Recordamini qualiter.

Nolite usque Alleluia.

Prosa: Suggestione angelica nutantia mulierum corda
nauiter solidantur.

TROPHUS:

Surrexit leo de tribu Iuda, quem impii suspenderunt in
ligno.

Monumenta hodie aperta sunt, et multa corpora sanctorum, surrexe<fol. 214^v>runt; dicite eia!

Resurrexi.

AD Repetendum TROPHUS

Virgine progenitus creui temptamina uicia, fixusque cruci mortem moriendo subegi. Resurrexi. Quem non deserui carnis dum tegmina sumpsi. Posuisti. Ut per metua sit uirtus clarescere alme. Mirabilis. Gloria, euouae.⁷⁷

In spite of the apparent intention of the introductory rubric, it is entirely possible that a considerable part of this text constitutes a processional for use before the Mass of Easter.

However seriously one may question the dramatic value of the textual accretions in the versions reviewed above, one cannot deny that the following text contains a definite and substantial extension of the dialogue:

1. IN DIE Sancto PASCHE TROPUS
2. <H>ora est, psallite; iubet dominus canere; eia dicite!
3. Ubi est Xpistus, meus Dominus et filius excelsi?
4. eamus uidere sepulcrum.
5. Quem queritis in sepulcro, Xpisticole?
6. Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
7. Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

⁷⁷ Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, ms. 123 (olim B. III. 18), Troparium Bononiense (?) sicc. xi, fol. 214r-214v. The letters *euouae* at the end of the text are the vowels of the final words of the Gloria Patri, —*seculorum, amen*,—sung at the end of the Introit. This vowel series is often written in this way merely as a support for the musical notes forming the cadence of the Gloria Patri.

8. ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes:
9. Alleluia, ad sepulcrum residens angelus nunciat
10. resurrexisse Xpistum.
11. En ecce completum est illud quod olim ipse per
12. prophetam dixerat ad Patrem, talier inquiens:
13. Resurrexi.⁷⁸

Variant:

Vich, Museum, ms. 124, Processionale License sœc. xiii-xiv, fol. Bv-
Cv.

1. *Tropus in die sancto Pasche.*

The liturgical introduction *Hora est* is here followed by an interrogation, *Ubi est Xpistus?* which is appropriate only to Maria Mater. That the other Maries are not absent from the intention of the text, however, is made certain by the plurals *eamus* and *Xpisticole*. The novel character of the dramatic addition appears from the fact that it is found neither in the Vulgate nor in the liturgy.

A somewhat similar text appears as follows:

<H>OC EST DE MULIERIBUS

Ubi est Xpistus, meus Dominus et Filius excelsus?
Eamus uidere sepulcrum.
Quem queritis in sepulcro, o Xpisticole?
Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nuntiate discipulis eius quia precedet uos in
Galileam.
Vere surrexit Dominus de sepulcro cum gloria,
Alleluia.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Vich, Museum, ms. 31, Troparium Ripollense sœc. xii-xiii, fol. 48v. The trope is not continued within the Introit.

⁷⁹ Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. latin 1139, Troparium Martialis sœc. xii, fol. 53r. The text above is followed immediately in the manuscript by the rubric *Sponsus* and the famous play of that name. For a list

This text is unique. Although it gains dramatically through the presence of *Ubi est Christus*, it loses by the omission of the usual response *Jesum nazarenum crucifixum*. As a matter of fact, it is by no means certain that this version constitutes a trope of the Introit. The manuscript gives us no assurance, for our text is immediately preceded by a series of irrelevant *versus*, and is immediately followed by the rubric *Sponsus* and the text of the famous dramatic piece of that name.⁸⁰

IV

It can scarcely be urged that the texts reviewed thus far record an impressive advance toward real drama. In some cases we have observed a palpable enlargement of the dialogue, but as yet we have noted no substantial indication either of *mise en scène* or of impersonation. We may proceed, then, to consider definite indications of this sort in the texts that follow. Pertinent information appears, for example, in a text of the eleventh century from Monte Cassino:

DOMINICUM SANCTUM PASCHA

FINITA TERTIA UADAT UNUS SACERDOS ANTE ALTARE ALBA
UESTE INDUTUS ET UERSUS AD CHORUM DICAT ALTA UOCE:

of previous texts of the version of *Quem quaeritis* in this manuscript see Lange, p. 4. Lange's own text of the trope (p. 22) is regrettably incomplete.

⁸⁰ A Poitiers version, of uncertain date, somewhat similar to the version before us is used not as a trope of the Introit, but as a *Visitatio Sepulchri* at the end of Matins (see Chambers, Vol. II, p. 29, note). Gautier (p. 221, note 3) seems to suggest that the words *Eamus videre sepulchrum* of the text printed above indicate the presence of the actual *sepulchrum* of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*.

Quem queritis?

ET DUO ALII CLERICI STANTES IN MEDIO CHORI RESPONDENT:

Iesum nazarenum.

ET SACERDOS:

Non est hic, surrexit.

ILLI UERO CONUERSI AD CHORUM DICANT:

Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus.

POST HEC INCIPIATUR TROPOS. SEQUITUR INTROITUS:

Resurrexi.⁸¹

According to this text a single priest standing before the altar addresses the angelic interrogation to two clerics standing in the middle of the choir. The two clerics deliver the reply of the Maries, and after receiving the angelic assurance, address to the choir their triumphant *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus*. In the assignment of parts we readily surmise an approach toward dramatic appropriateness,—one person speaking for the angel, and two persons for the Maries. As we shall see below, moreover, the stationing of the personages *ante altare* suggests a conscious and significant use of the altar as a stage-setting.

⁸¹ Monte Cassino, MS. 127, Missale Monasticum sæc. xi, fol. 105v. In connection with this text one should observe the following from Monte Cassino MS. 199, as calendared in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, Vol. iv, p. 124:

Dum canitur Tertia, aspergantur Fratres in choro aqua sancta, quae pridie benedicta est, etc. Antiph. ad Processionem peculiares. Qua finita vadat unus Sacerdos ante altare alba veste indutus, et versus ad chorum dicat alta voce: Quem quaeritis, et duo alii clerici stantes in medio chori respondeant: Jesum Nazarenum. Et Sacerdos: Non est hic. Illi vero conversi ad chorum dicant: Alleluia, resurrexit. Post haec tres alii cantent tropos, et agatur Missa ordine suo. Cf. Chambers, Vol. II, p. 12, note 1.

A similar disposition of the dialogue is seen in the following:

1. *Dominicum sanctum PASCHA. Statio ad Sanctam MARIA< M >.*
2. *INDUTUS presbyter SACRIS UESTIBUS STET POST*
3. *ALTARE ET DICAT ALTA UOCE:*
4. *Quem queritis in sepulcro, Xpisticole?*
5. *RESPONDEAT diaconus:*
6. *Hiesum nazarenum, o celicole.*
7. *Respondeat presbyter:*
8. *Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;*
9. *ite, nuntiate quia surrexit.*
10. *TUNC PERGIT diaconus CANENDO HEC USQUE IN CHORO:*
11. *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus.*
12. *ITEM uersus DE INTROITU: Hodie exultent iusti,*
13. *resurrexi< t > leo fortis; Deo gracias, dicite omnes.*
14. *Resurrexi. Versus: Lux mundi Dominus resur-*
15. *rexi< t > hodie. Posu< isti >.* *VERSUS: Manus tua,*
16. *Domine, saluavit mundum hodie, et ideo.*
17. *Mirabilis. Versus: Sciencia Domini mirabilis*
18. *facta est hodie, alleluia.*
19. *ALITER. Mulieres que ad sepulcrum uenerant*
20. *angelus dixit: iam surrexit Dominus. Resurrexi.*
21. *Versus: Cito euntes dicite, discipuli, quia*
22. *surrexit sicut dixit Dominus. Posu< isti >.*
23. *Versus: Ve tibi, Iu< fol. 48r > da, qui tradidisti*
24. *Dominum, et a Iudei< s > accepisti precium.*
25. *Mirabilis. ALITER. Hodie resurrexit leo fortis, Xpistus,*
26. *filius Dei; Deo gracias, dicite eia! Resurrexi.*
27. *Versus: Victor resurgens manens in secula Deus.*
28. *Posu< isti >.* *VERSUS: Omnes fringens tartara uictor*

29. exiit ad supera. *Mirabilis*. *Versus*: *Gloria*
 30. omnes in excelsis Domino dicite fratres, *Alleluia*.
 31. *Introitus*: *Resurrexi*.⁸²

Variant:

Benevento, Bibl. Capit., ms. 26, Troparium Beneventanum sœc. xii, fol. 68v-69r.

1. *Statio . . . Mariam*] omitted.
- 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, omitted.
4. *Quem*] *Versus* *Quem*. *sepulcro*] *sepulchro*.
11. *resurrexit*] *surrexit*.
12. Item . . . *Introitu*] *Tropus*.
13. *gracias*] *gratias*.
14. *Versus*] omitted.
15. *Versus*] omitted.
17. *Versus*: *Sciencia*] *Scientia*.
19. *Sepulcrum*] *sepulchrum*.
20. *Resurrexi*] omitted.
21. *Versus*] omitted.
23. *Versus*] omitted.
24. *precum*] *preium*.
26. *gracias dicite eia*] *gratias dicite alieia*.
27. *Versus*] omitted. *manens*] *mane*.
28. *Versus*] omitted.
29. *Versus*] omitted.

In this case a single priest standing behind the altar interrogates a single deacon stationed, apparently, in the sanctuary before the altar. After receiving the angelic assurance, the deacon transmits the message to the choir. There is no indication of impersonation; indeed, the assignment of parts is not dramatically appropriate, for the *Christicola* and the *Cælicola* are represented by single persons. The familiar trope is here followed, under a fresh rubric, by an internal troping of the Introit, and it

⁸² Benevento, Bibl. Capit., ms. 27, Troparium Beneventanum sœc. xii, fol. 47v-48r. In the manuscript the full text of the Introit follows.

is quite possible that in this text, and in the preceding one, *Quem queritis* is to be regarded as entirely detached from the Introit.

Here may be added another text of the version just considered:

1. *Dominicum Sanctum Pasca.*
2. *STET presbyter INDUTUS SACRIS UESTIBUS POST ALTARE;*
3. *DICAT MAGNA UOCE:*
4. *Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?*
5. *Respondeat diaconus:*
6. *Hiesum nazarenum, o celicole.*
7. *TUNC presbyter:*
8. *Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;*
9. *ite, nuntiate quia surrexit.*
10. *PERGAT diaconus CANENDO USQUE IN CHORO:*
11. *Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus.*
12. *ALITER uersus DE INTROITU: Hodie exultent⁸³*
13. *iusti.⁸⁴*

Variants:

Benevento, Bibl. Capit., ms. 25, Troparium Beneventanum sœc. xii, fol. 122v. A.—*Ibid.*, ms. 29, Troparium Beneventanum sœc. xi, fol. 20r. B.

1. *Pasca] Pascha B. Line omitted A.*
2. *Omitted A B.*
3. *Unus clericus post altare dicat A. Omitted B.*
4. *sepulchro] sepulcro A B.*
5. *Duo clerici albis induiti ante altare respondeant A. Omitted B.*
7. *Unus dicat A. Omitted B.*
10. *Duo dicant A. Omitted B.*
12. *Aliter . . . Introitu] Tropos A. Tropos B.*

⁸³ MS. exultant.

⁸⁴ Benevento, Bibl. Capit., ms. 28, Troparium Beneventanum sœc. xii, fol. 28r. In the manuscript follows a series of internal tropes of the Introit. I print the text above, and the variants, in order to show the variety of rubrics.

A real advance in dramatic appropriateness is seen in the following text:

IN DIE *sancto PASCE*, CUM OMNES SIMUL CONUENERINT
IN ECCLESIAM AD MISSAM CELEBRANDAM, STENT PARATI II^o
DIACONI INDUTI DALMATICIS RETRO ALTARE DICENTES:

<fol. 18^v> Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xristicole?
RESPONDEANT II^o CANTORES STANTES IN CHORO:

Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Iterum diaconi:

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia resurrexit, dicentes:

TUNC CANTOR DICAT EXCELSA UOCE:

Alleluia, resurrexit, Dominus.

Tunc psallat scola:

Resurrexi, <et adhuc tecum sum, alleluia>. Qui dicit Patri prophetica uoce. <fol. 19^r> Posuisti <super me manum tuam, alleluia: mirabilis facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia>. Mirabile laudat filius patrem. Psalmus: Domine probasti me, <et cognovisti me: tu cognovisti sessionem meam et resurrectionem meam>. Eia, karissimi, uerba canite Xpisti. Resurrexi, <et adhuc tecum sum, alleluia>. Victor ut ad celos calcata morte redire. Posuisti <super me manum tuam, alleluia>. Quo genus humanum, pulsis erroribus, altum scanderet ad celum. Mirabilis <facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia>. Nunc omnes cum ingenti gaudio celsa uoce gloriam Xpisto canite. Gloria <Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto; sicut erat in principio, et nunc et semper, et in secula> seculorum, Amen.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ Oxford, Bodleian, ms. Douce 222, Troparium Novaliciense sec. xi, fol. 18r-19r. This text has been previously published by N. C. Brooks, in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol.

The lines of the *Christicole* and *Cælicole* are here appropriately sung, in each case, by two persons. The rubric *parati duo diaconi induiti dalmaticis*, however, can hardly be interpreted as an indication of impersonation, for the dalmatic is the normal liturgical vestment of a deacon.

The variations seen in the following text are not without interest:

IN DIE SANCTO⁸⁶ PASCE TROPI.

FINITA TERTIA CANTOR CUM ALIIS UADAT RETRO ALTARE;
EXCELSA UOCE INCIPIAT:

Quem queritis⁸⁷ in sepulcro, Xpisticole?
Qui ANTE ALTARE FUERINT RESPONDEANT:

Hiesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

ILLI uero <QUI> RETRO FUERINT, DICANT:

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit, dicentes:

Qui ANTE RESPONDEANT:

Alleluia, alleluia, resurrexit Dominus.

ILLI QUI RETRO DICANT:

Eia, Carissimi, uerba canite Xpisti.

HIS FINITIS QUI RETRO FUERINT, ANTE ALTARE UENIANT
ET CUM ALIIS SIMUL CANTANT:

Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum, alleluia. Qui dicit
Patri prophetica uoce. Posuisti super me manum tuam,
alleluia. Mirabi<fol. 236^r>le laudat Filius Patrem.
Mirabilis facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia,
Psalmus: Domine probasti me, et <cognovisti me: tu cog-

VIII, pp. 463-464, and by the present writer, in *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, Vol. xvii, Part 1, p. 309.

⁸⁶ MS. SCM.

⁸⁷⁻⁸⁸ Written twice in the manuscript.

novisti sessionem meam, et > resurrectionem meam. Hodie exultant iusti, resurrexit leo fortis; Deo gracias, dicite eia! Resurrexi, et <ad hoc tecum sum, alleluia: posuisti super me manum tuam, alleluia: mirabilis facta est scientia tua, alleluia, alleluia>. <G>loria Patri <et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto: sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in secula s>e<c>u<l>o<r>u<m>, A-<m>e<n>. ⁸⁸

In this instance the number of persons engaged in the dialogue is not indicated. The transition from the dramatic trope to the Introit *Resurrexi* is gracefully accomplished through the liturgical formula, now familiar, *Eia, Carissimi, uerba canite Xpisti*, after the singing of which, the participants in the *Quem quæritis* dialogue join with others before the altar in singing the Introit.

Since a certain number of the texts just examined seem to suggest that the altar was used as *mise en scène* for the dialogue of the *Quem quæritis* Introit trope, it may be well to inquire concerning the *rationale* of this use, and to examine the independent evidence that the altar was regarded as *sepulchrum*. This evidence may be convenient-

⁸⁸ Piacenza, Bibl. Capit., ms. 65, Graduale-Troparium Placentinum sæc. xi-xii, fol. 235v-236r. Somewhat similar rubrics occur in a text to be found in Pistoia, Bibl. Capit., ms. 70, Troparium Pistoriense sæc. xi-xii, fol. 32r. Here may be placed a text from Monte Cassino recorded, from an unidentified manuscript, by E. Martene (*De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, Lyons, 1788, Vol. iv, p. 147):

Processione finita, vadat Sacerdos post altare, et versus ad chorum dicat alta voce, *Quem quæritis?* et duo alii Clerici stantes in medio chori respondeant: *Jesum Nazarenum*; et Sacerdos: *Non est hic.* Illi vero conversi ad chorum dicant: *Alleluja.* Post hæc alii quartuor cantent tropos, et agatur Missa ordine suo. Cf. Lange, No. 23, p. 23; Chambers, Vol. II, p. 12, note 1.

ly adduced from two chief sources: (1) the history of the Christian altar, and (2) patristic symbolism.

During the years immediately following the Crucifixion, the altars used in commemoration of the Last Supper were probably mere tables of wood (*mensæ*) in the houses of the faithful.⁸⁹ Later, during a century or two of persecution, the Commemoration was often observed in special and remote places, such as the catacombs about Rome, and similar places of burial. In such burial places the altar was inevitably placed, in some manner, over the body of a martyr or saint. It may have been constructed in a grave chapel above ground,⁹⁰ or it may have been the very cover of a sarcophagus, in a chamber under ground.⁹¹ Whatever its particular form, the Christian altar very early became closely associated with the tomb of a martyr or saint. In the well-chosen words of Hirn, "The *arca*, *i. e.*, the chest which contained the martyr's bones, became an *ara*, *i. e.*, a table bearing the flesh and blood of the divine man."⁹² It was natural, then, that with the erection of altars in churches, after the Peace of the Church, the identification of tomb and altar should have been piously maintained, and that the church altar should have been built, normally, over the tomb of a saint, or, to reverse the relation, that the relics of a saint (*Sancta Sancti*) should have been buried under the altar.⁹³ Thus it happens that to

⁸⁹ C. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe: Études archéologiques sur ses monuments*, Vol. I, Paris, 1883, pp. 103, 237; Parenty, *Recherches sur la Forme des Autels* in *Congrès Scientifique de France*, Session XX, 1853, Vol. II, pp. 201-202.

⁹⁰ Y. Hirn, *The Sacred Shrine*, London, 1912, pp. 14-18.

⁹¹ Rohault de Fleury, Vol. I, pp. 103-109, 237; Parenty, p. 202.

⁹² Hirn, p. 23.

⁹³ J. Mallet, *Cours élémentaire d'Archéologie religieuse*, Vol. II, Paris, 1900, pp. 13-14; J. Corblet, *Essai historique et liturgique sur les Ciboires et la réserve de l'Eucharistie*, Paris, 1858, pp. 77-78; Parenty, p. 202; Hirn, p. 26.

this day, under the main altar of many an historic church edifice, may be found the tomb of a saint, the saint's place of rest being variously called *Confessio*, *Martyrium*, or *Testimonium*.⁹⁴

As the number of churches increased throughout the Christian world, however, it became impossible to provide for each altar the entire remains of a saint, and a subdividing of relics became necessary. Instead of resting upon the body of a saint, the altar could now be associated with only a small particle, or small particles. These relics were sometimes placed in an appropriate reliquary under the altar,⁹⁵ or, as was more common, in an excavation in the top of the stone altar-table, the cavity being regularly called *sepulchrum*.⁹⁶ In the *sepulchrum* was placed a closed box (*capsa*),—usually a small, formless envelope of lead,—containing the relics, and the *sepulchrum* cavity was closed with a stone seal (*sigillum*).⁹⁷

For the mediæval worshipper the transition was easy from the use of the altar as the tomb of a saint to the idea of the altar as the sepulchre of Christ. It appears, indeed, that in the *sepulchrum* of the altar the relics of the saint were sometimes actually replaced by "fragments of the Saviour's body," that is, by pieces of a consecrated wafer.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ De Caumont, *Cours d'Antiquités Monumentales*, Part vi, Paris, 1841, pp. 112-118; *Congrès Scientifique de France*, Session xxii (Puy), 1855, Vol. II, p. 523; X. Barbier de Montault, *Le Martyrium de Poitiers*, Poitiers, 1885, *passim*; Parenty, p. 202.

⁹⁵ Parenty, p. 207.

⁹⁶ H. A. Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, Vol. I, Leipzig, 1847, p. 375; Parenty, p. 203; Mallet, Vol. II, pp. 13-14; Corblet, p. 77; Barbier de Montault, pp. 45, 53.

⁹⁷ H. Otte, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunst-Archäologie des deutschen Mittelalters*, Vol. I, Leipzig, 1883, pp. 131, 134.

⁹⁸ See Hirn, p. 68.

In such a case the altar became literally the grave of Christ.

Whether or not the altar was often recognized as *Sepulchrum Christi* through such *material* means, we have ample evidence that the altar was so accepted *symbolically*.⁹⁹

In the *Theoria* of Germanus I, Patriarch of Constantinople († 733), we read:

Altare est Propiciatorium in quo offerebatur pro peccato,
iuxta sanctum monumentum Christi in quo altari victimam se
Christus obtulit Deo et Patri, per oblationem corporis sui.
. . . Altare est et dicitur præsepe et sepulchrum Domini.¹⁰⁰

A similar interpretation is given by Amalarius of Metz († 837) in his *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*:

Per particulam oblatæ immissæ in calicem obstenditur Christi
corpus quod jam resurrexit a mortuis; per comedam a sacer-
dote vel a populo, ambulans adhuc super terram; *per relictam*
*in altari, jacens in sepulcris.*¹⁰¹

Again, in his *Eclogæ de Officio Missæ* Amalarius writes the following verse:

Ecce habes hic tumulum Christi quam conspicis aram.¹⁰²

Simeon Thessalonicus († 1430), in his *Expositio de Divino Templo*, speaks of the altar as *magni sacrificii officium*.

⁹⁹ See Rohault de Fleury, Vol. I, pp. 107-109, 239; *Annales Archéologiques*, Vol. IV, pp. 238, 241-242, 246-248; F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyclopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, Vol. I, Freiburg, 1882, pp. 39, 89-90; J. B. E. Pascal, *Origines et Raison de la Liturgie Catholique*, Paris, 1863, col. 96-97; *De Processionibus Liber*, Paris, 1641, pp. 181-191.

¹⁰⁰ *Bibliothecae Patrum et Veterum Auctorum Ecclesiasticorum*, Vol. VI, Paris, 1610, col. 116.

¹⁰¹ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CV, col. 1154-1155.

¹⁰² Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CV, col. 1326.

cina and *Christi monumentum*,¹⁰³ and concerning the relics under the altar-table, writes as follows:

Sub mensa deinde repositæ sunt reliquiae, utpote quorū spiritus Christo magno martyri semper ad sint. Præterea tanquam Ecclesiæ fundamenta hos altare continet, quæ primo Christi, postea per ipsum martyrum sanguine condita est.¹⁰⁴

Further testimony as to the symbolism of the altar, and final confirmation of our surmise that the altar serves as the *sepulchrum* setting for the *Quem quæritis* dialogue in the texts given above, are found in the famous *Rationale* of Durandus (1237-1276), Bishop of Mende:

Nec omittendum, quod in quibusdam Ecclesiis in his septem diebus *duo in albis superpelliciis* incipiunt responsorium: Hæc dies; et in aliis quosdam *tropos retro altare*,—quod representat *sepulchrum* pro eo quod corpus Iesu in eo sacramentaliter collocatur, et consecratur,—gerentes typum duorum angelorum, qui stantes in sepulchro Christum resurrexisse retulerunt.¹⁰⁵

This description of *tropos retro altare* seems to apply precisely to the texts printed above from Oxford ms. Douce 222 and Piacenza ms. 65, and it proves definitively that in such cases the altar serves as a *sepulchrum* for the dialogue. From Durandus' words *duo in albis superpelliciis* . . . *gerentes typum duorum angelorum* we might, indeed, infer that in such versions of *Quem quæritis* the characters concerned in the dialogue were actually impersonated; but the evidence on this point is not quite conclusive.

¹⁰³ Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CLV, col. 703.

¹⁰⁴ *Id.*, Vol. CLV, col. 706.

¹⁰⁵ Gulielmus Durandus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Lugduni, 1559, fol. 378r.

V

It cannot be denied that in the group of versions just examined, the advance toward drama is considerable. The primitive dialogue has at length been provided with a *mise en scène*, and in some cases the sentences have been distributed among the singers with dramatic appropriateness. None of these versions, however, can be definitively identified as true drama, for no dramatic piece can be so identified unless the characters concerned in the action are unmistakably impersonated. Our search for a version providing such impersonation is rewarded in the following text:

IN DIE PASCE CANTORIA ACCIPIANT DUAS DOMINAS ET PONANT POST ALTARE MAIUS IN LOCO ANGELORUM, ET CANTENT ISTAM TROPHAM, *sic*:

Quem queritis?

ET CANTORIA ACCIPIANT TRES DOMINAS que HABEANT SINGULA UASSA ARIENTEA IN MANIBUS, et CANERE DEBEANT IN MEDIO CHORO AD MODUM TRES MARIE, ET RESPONDEANT ANGELIS *sic*:

Ihesum nazarenum.

Respondeant ANGELI:

Non est hic, sur<r>exit.

TRES MARIE ET CANTE<N>T ADHUC TROPHAE<M>, *sic*:

Alleluia, resurrexit.

ET HOC FACTO EBDOMODARIA EPISTOLE¹⁰⁶ TENEAT SEPULCRUM EBORIS IN MANIBUS IN MEDIO CHORO DONEC EXPLEAT Epistolam, et incipiat OFFICIUM¹⁰⁷ MISSE:

Resur<r>exi, et adhuc tecum sum.

ET TRES MARIE respondeant ISTAM TROPHAM:

Qui dicit Patri propheti<c>a uoce.

¹⁰⁶ MS. epla.

¹⁰⁷ MS. officiū.

ET CHORUS RESPONDEAT *sic*:

Posuisti super me manum tuam.

TRES MARIE RESPONDEANT:

Mirabilem laudat Filius Patrem.

CHORUS RESPONDEAT:

Mirabilis facta est scientia tua.

ET TRES MARIE UADANT DEORSUM TUNC AD ALTARE MAIUS
AD OFFERENDUM SUA¹⁰⁸ UASA ARGENTEA, ET CHORUS DICAT
UERSUM:

Domine probasti me.

ET CHORUS INCIPIAT OFFICIUM:¹⁰⁹

Resurrexi.¹¹⁰

ET ALIUS CHORUS DICAT:

Gloria Patri.

ET HOC DICTO UENIANT TANTUM TRES¹¹¹ MARIE
<quae> RESPONDEANT SUPERIUS IN MEDIO CHORO ET
DICANT ISTAM TROPHAM, *sic*:

Hodie resurrexit.

ET HIIS FINITIS TRES MARIE REUERTANT AD LOCA SUA; ET
EBDOMODARIA INCIPIAT ADHUC OFFICIUM¹¹² MISSE:

Resurrexi.¹¹³

ET CHORUS EXPLEAT, ET CANTORIA INCIPIAT PROSAM *sic*:

Domine redemptor.

ET EBDOMODARIA INCIPIAT: Kyrie.¹¹⁴

Although a blundering scribe has cruelly mutilated this text,¹¹⁵ the essentials of this play can be easily recovered.

¹⁰⁸ MS. tua.

¹⁰⁹ MS. offitiū.

¹¹⁰ MS. Resurrexit.

¹¹¹⁻¹¹¹ MS. Et hoc dicto ueniant tantum hoc dicto tres.

¹¹² MS. offitiū.

¹¹³ MS. Resurrexit.

¹¹⁴ Brescia, Biblioteca Civica Quiriniana, ms. H. vi. 11., Ordinarium Ecclesiae SanctaeJuliae anni 1438, fol. 30r.

¹¹⁵ I have tampered as little as possible with the hideous Latinity of this text, and have, in every case, indicated my alteration.

The two nuns behind the altar certainly impersonate angels,—*in loco angelorum*,—and the three nuns in the middle of the choir, who carry silver vessels, avowedly impersonate the three Maries,—*ad modum tres Marie*. The fact that the Maries offer their vessels at the altar suggests that the altar is regarded as *Sepulchrum Christi*. The rubrics do not fully explain the significance and use of the *sepulchrum eboris* which is held in plain sight by the nun who reads the Epistle, until the reading has been finished. The ivory sepulchre may be merely a part of the altar *mise en scène*, a stage-property appropriated by the *Hebdomadaria Epistolæ* during her reading. It is interesting to observe that at the conclusion of the dialogue, the *tres Mariæ* take part in the singing of the internal trope of the Introit, the choir singing the liturgical text, and the Maries, the trope.

The text from Brescia appears to be the only one yet published which presents a completely dramatized form of the *Quem quæritis* trope in its attachment to the Easter Introit. Although this particular text is late and corrupt, it seems to represent the inevitable culmination of the earlier developments of *Quem quæritis* that we have been examining, and it appears to demonstrate that the trope evolved into true drama in its original position as an introduction to the Easter Mass.

VI

For the sake of completeness,—even at the risk of anti-climax,—it behooves us to consider two other manifestations of *Quem quæritis* in connection with the Mass of Easter: (1) in the processional before Mass, and (2) as part of an Easter sequence.

In our review of the texts printed above we have already observed that in some cases the *Quem quæritis* dialogue is detached from the Introit proper, or is, at least, attached to the Introit only tenuously.¹¹⁶ In the text from Monte Cassino ms. 127, for example, at the end of the dialogue occurs the rubric *Post hec incipiatur tropos. Sequitur Introitus: Resurrexi*.¹¹⁷ This rubric seems to indicate that *Quem quæritis* is not closely bound to the Introit, being separated from it by another trope. In some of these cases in which the dialogue appears to be independent, it may possibly be serving as a processional, or even as an independent dramatic ceremony *ad sepulchrum*. The use of it as a processional seems to be explicitly indicated by the introductory rubric in the following text:

IN PROCESSIONE Domini

Hora est, psallite; iubet dominus canere; eia dicite!
INTERrogatio: Quem que<fol. 70^r>ritis in sepulchro, o
 Xpisticole?
Responsio: Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o cēlicole.
 Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
 ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes:
 Surrexit enim <sicut dixit Dominus: Ecce precedet
 uos in Galileam; ibi eum uidebitis, alleluia, alleluia>.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Examples may be seen above from the following manuscripts: Zürich, Rheinau ms. 97 (see p. 15), Turin ms. G. v. 20 (see p. 31) Turin ms. F. iv. 18 (see p. 32), and Rome, Angelica ms. 123 (see pp. 32-33).

¹¹⁷ See above, pp. 35-36. See also the text from Benevento ms. 27, above, pp. 37-38.

¹¹⁸ Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Selden supra 27, Troarium Heidenhemense sāc. xi, fol. 69v-70r. The text above is followed immediately, in the manuscript, by the rubric *In Die Sancto Pasche*, introducing a series of tropes of the Introit *Resurrexi*.

Here the processional text consists solely in a form of the trope with which we are already familiar.¹¹⁹

The use of *Quem queritis* as an incidental element in a longer processional is shown in the following:

DOMINICA SANCTA PASCAE AD PROCESSIONEM

In die resurrectionis meae dicit Dominus, aeuia: Congregabo gentes et colligam regna et effundam super uos aquam mundam, aeuia.

Vidi aquam egredientem de templo a latere dextro, aeuia, et omnes ad quos peruenit aqua ista salui facti sunt et dicent aeuia, aeuia.

Interrogatio: Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?

Responsio: Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o caelicole.

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

Surrexit enim sicut dixit Dominus; ecce precedet uos in Galileam; ibi eum uidebitis, aeuia, aeuia.

Sedit angelus ad sepulchrum Domini stola claritatis <p. 107> coopertus; uidentes eum mulieres nimio terrore perterritate substiterunt a longe. Tunc locutus est angelus et dixit eis: Nolite metuere; dico uobis quia illum quem queritis mortuum, iam uiuit, et uita hominum cum eo surrexit, aeuia. *Versus*: Recordamini quomodo predixit quia oportet Filium hominis crucifigi, et tertia die a morte suscitari, aeuia. *Versus*: Crucifixum Dominum laudate, et sepultum propter nos glorificate, resurgentemque a morte adorate. Nolite <metuere; dico uobis quia illum quem queritis mortuum, iam uiuit, et uita hominum cum eo surrexit, aeuia>.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ See above, p. 17.

¹²⁰ St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, ms. 339, Graduale-Sacramentarium Sangallense sœc. x, pp. 106-107. Reproduced in photographic fac-

A similar text from Hartker's famous *Liber Respon-salis* appears as follows:

IN DIE RESURRECTIONIS AD PROCESSIONEM

Antiphona: In die resurrectionis meae dicit Dominus, aeuia: Congregabo gentes, *et* colligam regna, *et* effundam super uos aquam mundam, aeu*<i>a*.

Antiphona: Vidi aquam egredientem de templo a latere dextro, aeuia, *et* omnes ad quos peruenit aqua ista salui facti sunt *et* dicent aeuia, aeuia.

Interrogatio: Quem queritis in sepulchro, Xpisticole?

Responsio: Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicolae?

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

Antiphona: Surrexit enim sicut dixit Dominus: Ecce praecedet uos in Galileam; ibi eum uidebitis, aeuia, aeuia.

Antiphona: Sedit angelus ad sepulchrum Domini stola claritatis coopertus; uidentes eum mulieres nimio terrore perterriti substiterunt a longe. Tunc locutus est angelus *et* dixit eis: Nolite metuere, dico uobis quia illum quem queritis mortuum, iam uiuit, *et* uita hominum cum eo surrexit, alleluia. *Versus:* Recordamini quomodo predixit, quia oportet Filium hominis cruci*<p. 38>*figi *et* tertia die a morte suscitari. Nolite metuere.

Antiphona: Et recordate sunt uerborum eius, *et* regresse a monumento nuntiauerunt hec omnia illis undecim *et* ceteris omnibus, aeuia. *Versus:* Crucifixum Dominum

simile in *Paléographie Musicale*, Vol. I, Solesmes, 1888-90, pp. 75-76. The text as printed above is followed immediately by the rubric: In Die ad Missam, introducing the Introit: *Resurrexi*. With the text from ms. 339 may be listed the similar text, in St. Gall ms. 387, *Breviarium Sangallense* sæc. xi, pp. 57-58. Lange (no. 4, p. 22) exhibits the *Quem quæritis* dialogue from ms. 387; but since his text is isolated from the surrounding processional antiphons, it is quite misleading and useless.

laudate, et sepultum propter uos glorificate, resurgentemque a morte adorate, alleluia.¹²¹

The presence of this text in the *Liber Responsalis*, and its consequent association, externally, with the Canonical Office, might, at first sight, suggest that this processional was designed for use in some part of the *Cursus*, rather than as an introduction to the Mass. The rubric *Ad Vespertas*, which follows the processional text in the manuscript, might seem to indicate that the procession was celebrated as part of Vespers. The liturgical content of the text, however, and its resemblance to the processional from St. Gall ms. 339,—a processional indisputably associated with the Mass,—these considerations identify our text as a stray from the *Missale*, only accidentally lodged in the *Liber Responsalis* of the *Cursus*.

In connection with the next version, special considerations arise:

IN DOMINICO DIE SANCTI PASCAE
IN PROCESSIONE AD SEPULCRUM <p. 197>

Quem queritis in sepulcro, o Xpicticole?
Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o caelicole.
Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulcro.

¹²¹ St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, ms. 391, Liber Responsalis Hartkeri sœc. x, pp. 37-38. This text is shown in photographic facsimile in *Paléographie Musicale*, Deuxième Série, Vol. I, Solesmes, 1900, pp. 231-232. A mutilated version of the passage given above is printed by J. M. Thomasius, *Opera Omnia* (ed. Vezzosi), Vol. IV, Rome, 1749, p. 238. The text printed above is immediately preceded by the last antiphon of Lauds, and is immediately followed by the rubric: *Ad Vespertas*. Lange (No. 3, p. 22), extracts the *Quem queritis* dialogue from this text, printing it in useless isolation from its context. The same may be said of Lange's treatment of *Quem queritis* from St. Gall mss. 374 and 378 (Lange Nos. 2 and 5, p. 22), each of which contains a processional essentially similar to that printed above.

Surrexit enim sicut dixit Dominus: Ecce precedet uos in Galileam; ibi eum uidebitis, aeuia, aeuia.

Sedit angelus ad sepulcrum Domini stola claritatis copertus; uidentes eum mulieres nimio terrore perterritę substiterunt a longe. Tunc locutus est angelus et dixit eis: Nolite metuere, dico uobis quia illum quem queritis mortuum iam uiuit, et uita hominum cum eo surrexit, aeuia.

Recordamini quomodo predixit quia oportet Filium hominis crucifigi et tercia die a morte suscitari.

Crucifixum Dominum laudate, et sepultum propter nos glorificate, resurgentemque a morte adorate, aeuia.¹²²

Although this text seems to constitute a processional for use before Mass, the introductory rubric *In Processione ad Sepulcrum* indicates that the procession included a station at a regular Easter Sepulchre,—a station which may account for the presence of *Quem quæritis* in this text and in other processional texts of which the rubrics are less explicit. For the existence of some sort of Easter Sepulchre at St. Gall as early as the eleventh century, we have independent evidence.¹²³

A brief version of the processional appears, finally, in the following form:

IN PROCESSIONE

Sedit angelus ad sepulchrum Domini stola claritatis coopertus; uidentes eum mulieres nimio terrore perterritę

¹²² St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, ms. 376, Troparium Sangallense sæc. xi, pp. 196-197. This text is followed immediately by the Introit: *Resurrexi*.

¹²³ See an article by the present writer entitled *The Harrowing of Hell in Liturgical Drama*, in *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, Vol. xvi, Part II, pp. 897-898.

astiterunt a longe. Tunc locutus est angelus et dixit eis: Nolite metuere; dico uobis quia illum quem queritis mortuum iam uiuit, et uita hominum cum <fol. 60^v> eo surrexit, alleluia.

Quem queritis in sepulchro Xpisticole?
 Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
 Non est hic, surrexit sicut locutus est;
 ite, nuntiate quia surrexit, dicentes:
 Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus.
 Nolite.¹²⁴

From our examination of the dramatic dialogue as an element in the processional of Easter Day we pass, finally, to a brief consideration of a special form of the *Quem queritis* formula as it appears in certain sequences of Easter Week. This use is seen in the following text:

*Sequentia.*¹²⁵

Quem queritis, mulieres, ad sepulchrum regem? Alleluia.
Versus: Hiesum querimus, et non inueniemus ubi erat positus.

Versus: Si tu tuleris, hoc dicio¹²⁶ mihi, ubi erat positus.
Versus: Cum fletu et stridore¹²⁷ dentium ubi uadam?
 Eum tollam positum.

Versus: O quam gloriosus fuit ille mortuus!
Versus: O quam gloriosa erit uita ubi se reuiscerat!
Versus: Stabat angelus ad dextris Patris: Noli flere, Regina Coeli, quia mortuus fuerat, et reuixit.
Versus: Si mihi non creditis, operibus credite et uidete, in dextra Dei sedens.

¹²⁴ Monza, Bibl. Capit., ms. K. 11., Graduale-Troparium sœc. xii ex., 60r-60v. The text given above is followed immediately, in the manuscript, by the rubric: *Trophi ad Introitum Misse.*

¹²⁵ The Sequence for Easter Monday (Feria ii^a post Pascha).

¹²⁶ MS. dicit.

¹²⁷ MS. stridor.

Versus: Stella clara, lux magna uita, regem sedere Deo uidi.

Versus: Deo gratias, Deo gratias, quia surrexit leo fortis.
<fol. 74^v>.

Versus: Deo gratias, Deo gratias, de magna tristitia reuertimur in letitia.

Versus: Deo gratias, Deo gratias; Amen dico uobis.
Alleluia.¹²⁸

A somewhat different version of this sequence appears in the following form:

<SEQUENTIA>

Ad sepulcri custodes descenderat angelus ualde iam diluculo.

Mulieres ueniuunt inuisendum sepulchrum ad quas dixit angelus:

Quem queritis, mulieres, ad sepulcrum Domini?

Responderunt et dixerunt cuncte unanimiter:

Iesum quaerimus, et non inuenimus <fol. 138^r> ubi erat positus.

Si tu tuleris, dicio michi ubi uadam; eum tollam Dominum.

O, quam gloriosus fuit ille mortuus!

O, quam gloriosa erat uita ubi se reuixerat!

Stabat angelus ad sepulchrum:

¹²⁸ Ivrea, Bibl. Capit., ms. 60, Troparium Eporediense sæc. xi in. (1001-1011), fol. 74r-74v. The text above, with variants from the text of D. Georgius (*De Liturgia Romani Pontificis*, Vol. III, Rome, 1744, pp. 492-493), is printed in *Analecta Hymnica*, Vol. XL, Leipzig, 1902, p. 15. Variant texts, are to be found also in Benevento, Bibl. Capit., ms. 27, Troparium Beneventanum sæc. xii, fol. 58r-58v (Feria v^a post Pascha); *Ibid.*, ms. 28, Troparium Beneventanum sæc. xii, fol. 41v (Feria v^a post Pascha); *Ibid.*, ms. 29, Troparium Beneventanum sæc. xii, fol. 37v-38r (Sabbato post Pascha); and Paris, Bibl. Nat., ms. Nouv. Acq. 1669, Graduale Eugubinense sæc. xii ex., fol. 96r-96v (Sabbato post Pascha).

Noli flere, Regina mundi, quia mortuus fuerat, et reuixit.
Deo gratias, Deo gratias, Deo gratias.
De magna tristitia uertit in laetitia.
Deo gratias, Deo gratias, Deo gratias.
Amen dico uobis, Alleluia.¹²⁹

Although the appearance of the *Quem quæritis* interrogation in these sequences is interesting, it seems to have no important bearing upon the dramatic development of the Easter trope in its association with the Mass. The importance of these sequences will appear, rather, in another connection: in a study of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter Matins.

In the pages above, the developments of *Quem quæritis* in its association with the Easter Mass are, I believe, for the first time presented with considerable fulness. From this examination of the materials, then, we are in a position to draw one or two conclusions.

In the first place, it appears that even as an appendage of the Introit, the trope achieved a considerable textual development, and that this growth continued until long after the time when the trope of the Introit became also a trope of the responsory or of the *Te Deum*, and began its productive dramatic career as a *Visitatio Sepulchri* at the end of Easter Matins. The question as to how much one line of development influenced the other must be dealt with at another time. It may be observed in advance, however, that the textual accretions to the Introit trope are, in general, quite different from the accretions embodied in the texts of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*.

¹²⁹ Benevento, Chapter Library, ms. 25, Troparium Beneventanum sœc. xii, fol. 137v-138r. This text constitutes the sequence for the Mass of Thursday in Easter Week (Feria v^a post Pascha).

The textual growth of the Introit trope was due to what we may term *free composition*. Like the sentences of the simplest form of *Quem queritis*, the accretions are, as a whole, not mere borrowings from the liturgy or the Vulgate, but are rather the original creations of a succession of liturgical poets.¹³⁰

Still more important is the fact that the trope actually developed into true drama in its original position at the Introit. Since the only text that unequivocally records this final stage is presented in a late manuscript,¹³¹ one might surmise that this development was due to the influence of the more fruitful *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Matins. Although, for the moment, the matter must be left undecided, the variety of dramatic stages displayed above seems to indicate that the final dramatic result of the trope at the Introit was an independent achievement.

KARL YOUNG.

¹³⁰ The sentence *Pascha nostrum Xpystus est, immolatus agnus est, etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est Xpystus*, which is found in the Turin manuscripts G. v. 20 and F. iv. 18 (see above, p. 31), and which may or may not be considered part of the trope proper, rests, in part, upon the Alleluia-verse of Easter Day, *'Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus* (see Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, LXXVIII, 678), or upon the Vulgate *Etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus* (*1 Cor.*, v, 7). The sentence *Surrexit Dominus, surrexit Cristus; iam non moritur; mors illi ultra non dominabitur, alleluia*, seen in MS. 123 of the Angelica Library in Rome (see above, p. 32), is based, in part, upon the *Communio* of the Mass for Wednesday in Easter week, *Christus resurgens ex mortuis jam non moritur, alleluia; mors illi ultra non dominabitur, alleluia, alleluia* (see *Pat. Lat.*, LXXVIII, 679), or upon the Vulgate *Scientes quod Christus resurgens ex mortuis jam non moritur; mors illi ultra non Dominabitur* (*Rom. vi*, 9). For the added sentences as a whole, however, no such sources can be pointed out.

¹³¹ Brescia ms. H. vi. 11., of the fifteenth century. See above, pp. 47-48.